

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF FEDERAL CLAIMS  
OFFICE OF SPECIAL MASTERS

No. 13-0967V

Filed: March 26, 2015

(Not to be published)

\*\*\*\*\*

BENJAMIN FOLLEN,

Petitioner,

v.

SECRETARY OF HEALTH  
AND HUMAN SERVICES,

Respondent.

\*\*\*\*\*

*Howard Scott Gold, Esq.*, Gold Law Firm, LLC, Wellesley Hills, MA for petitioner.

*Claudia Gangi, Esq.*, U.S. Dep't. of Justice, Washington, DC for respondent.

**DECISION<sup>1</sup>**

**Gowen**, Special Master:

On December 9, 2013, petitioner filed a petition for Vaccine Compensation in the National Vaccine Injury Compensation Program [“the Program”],<sup>2</sup> alleging that he suffered from brachial plexitis as a result of the influenza vaccine. The information in the record, however, does not show entitlement to an award under the Program. On March 26, 2015, petitioner moved for a decision dismissing this petition.

To receive compensation under the Program, petitioner must prove either 1) that he suffered a “Table Injury” – i.e., an injury falling within the Vaccine Injury Table, or 2) that he suffered an injury that was actually caused by a vaccine. See §§ 13(a)(1)(A)

---

<sup>1</sup> Because this unpublished decision contains a reasoned explanation for the action in this case, I intend to post this decision on the United States Court of Federal Claims' website, in accordance with the E-Government Act of 2002, Pub. L. No. 107-347, § 205, 116 Stat. 2899, 2913 (codified as amended at 44 U.S.C. § 3501 note (2006)). In accordance with Vaccine Rule 18(b), petitioner have 14 days to identify and move to delete medical or other information, that satisfies the criteria in § 300aa-12(d)(4)(B). Further, consistent with the rule requirement, a motion for redaction must include a proposed redacted decision. If, upon review, I agree that the identified material fits within the requirements of that provision, I will delete such material from public access.

<sup>2</sup> The Program comprises Part 2 of the National Childhood Vaccine Injury Act of 1986, Pub. L. No. 99-660, 100 Stat. 3755, codified as amended, 42 U.S.C. §§ 300aa-10 *et seq.* (hereinafter “Vaccine Act” or “the Act”). Hereafter, individual section references will be to 42 U.S.C. § 300aa of the Act.

and 11(c)(1). An examination of the record did not uncover any evidence that petitioner suffered a “Table Injury.” Further, the record does not contain persuasive evidence indicating that petitioner’s alleged injury was vaccine-caused.

Under the Act, petitioner may not be given a Program award based solely on the petitioner’s claims alone. Rather, the petition must be supported by either medical records or by the opinion of a competent physician. § 13(a)(1). In this case, because there are insufficient medical records supporting petitioner’s claim, a medical opinion must be offered in support. Petitioner, however, has offered no such opinion that supports a finding of entitlement.

Accordingly, it is clear from the record in this case that petitioner has failed to demonstrate either that he suffered a “Table Injury” or that his injuries were “actually caused” by a vaccination. **Thus, this case is dismissed for insufficient proof. The Clerk shall enter judgment accordingly.**

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

**/sThomas L. Gowen**

Thomas L. Gowen  
Special Master